

Village of Barrington
Architectural Review Commission
Minutes Summary

Date: September 22, 2005

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Location: Village Board Room
200 South Hough Street
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: John Julian III, Chairperson
Karen Plummer, Commissioner
Stephen Petersen, Commissioner
Marty O'Donnell, Commissioner
Mimi Troy, Commissioner

Staff Members: Jim Wallace, Director

Call to Order

Mr. Julian called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The Roll Call noted the following: John Julian III, present; Joseph Coath, absent; Stephen Petersen, present; Karen Plummer, present; Marty O'Donnell, present; Mimi Troy, present; Lisa McCauley, absent. There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

Old Business

ARC 05-10 Schatsick Residence, 207 W. Station Street (Public Hearing - Historic)
Petitioner: Carl Schatsick, Owner

Mr. Julian swore in the petitioner.

The property is located in the H Historic Preservation Overlay District and is zoned R-6 Single Family Residential. The petitioner is proposing to demolish the existing garage structure and has submitted plans for approval of a new garage. Staff completed a preliminary Zoning Review and the new building appeared to meet all of the zoning regulations at that time. At the preliminary meeting held on May 12, 2005, the ARC stated its intent to have members visit the site to determine whether the existing garage should be demolished. At the September 8, 2005 meeting, the ARC voted 4-0 that the garage was beyond repair and should be demolished.

Mr. Julian asked Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Petersen, both of whom had visited the site, whether they felt the garage should be demolished.

Mr. O'Donnell and Mr. Petersen both agreed that the garage should be demolished.

Motion by Ms. Plummer seconded by Ms. Troy to demolish the existing garage. Voice Vote noted all ayes.

Mr. Julian asked if anyone from the public wished to speak. There was none.

Mr. Julian asked for the staff report.

Staff reviewed the petition as new construction and evaluated the petition based on the standards in the Zoning Ordinance.

1. Scale and Form – the new construction is visually compatible with the surrounding structures on the site and on nearby properties. The height is not excessive (approximately 14-foot mean roof height) and the apparent

width and scale of the structure is broken up through the use of the offset in the front façade. The roof shape is a hip, as is the roof of the main structure on the site.

2. Composition of Principal Facades – the width-to-height ratios of the new windows and doors are consistent with other detached garages in the area, as is the relationship of voids to solids on the principally-viewed facades (front and right). The cementitious lap siding proposed is visually compatible with the surrounding structures and streetscape. Staff believes this standard is met, provided the following details are confirmed and are satisfactory to the ARC:

- a. Window material
- b. Window casings
- c. Vehicle door style and material
- d. Service door style, materials and casing

3. Relationship to Street – Staff felt that the standards in subsections 3a, 3d and 3e did not apply to this petition. The rhythm and spacing of the structure are appropriate, as the structure will be located in the far rear corner of the property, as is traditionally expected with detached garage units in the historic district. This location, more than 40 feet from the house, will help maintain an appropriate relationship between the single-story three-car garage and the two-story main structure. The vehicle doors of the structure are appropriately oriented to the street and the service door is appropriately oriented to the interior rear yard between the garage and house.

Staff recommended that if the ARC can clarify the details from Section One and finds the details to be satisfactory, the ARC should adopt the above findings as modified and approve the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of the new garage.

Mr. Julian asked for a motion to adopt staff's findings.

Motion by Mr. Petersen to adopt staff's findings as modified. Ms. Troy seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote

Julian – yes

Plummer - yes

Petersen - yes

Troy - yes

O'Donnell – yes

Motion carried.

Mr. Schatsick submitted revised garage door and window plans for the proposed garage.

Ms. Troy asked if there are muntins on the primary structure.

Mr. Schatsick replied no.

The commission discussed using half-round gutters and the petitioner agreed to do so.

Ms. Troy asked why muntins are proposed for the garage.

Mr. Schatsick replied they could be removed.

Mr. Julian asked the Commission if they had any comments.

Ms. Troy recommended adding one or two feet to the right of the garage to allow extra room to open their car doors.

Mr. Wallace recommended allowing the petitioner to have the ability to add an extra footage if he preferred.

Mr. Petersen commented that the petitioner should increase the left bay of the garage to twenty-two (22) feet and the right bay to twelve (12) feet.

Mr. O'Donnell asked if the window details could be required to be similar to the window details of the house.

Mr. Wallace read the following conditions by the ARC:

1. Corner boards to match the existing home.
2. Eave details to match the existing home including a bed-mold frieze.
3. Increasing the left bay of the garage to twenty-two (22) feet and the right bay to twelve (12) feet.
4. Approval of any of the proposed six-panel steel garage door plans, any of which without a window.
5. Windows to be made of wood with smooth or cementitious trim to match existing home.
6. Installation of half-round gutters.
7. Garage windows to be one-over-one.

Motion by Mr. Petersen to approve ARC 05-10 subject to the above conditions. Mr. O'Donnell seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote

Julian – yes

Plummer - yes

Petersen - yes

Troy - yes

O'Donnell – yes

Motion carried.

New Business

ARC 05-23 Niminski Master Sign Plan, 243-247 West Northwest Highway (Non-Historic)

Petitioner: Steve Ignarski, Sign Craft, Franksville, Wisconsin

The petitioner requests approval of a Master Sign Plan. The sign plan designates one wall sign for each of the occupants of the building. Window signage is also included in the Master Sign Plan. The plan indicates three (3) commercial spaces in the building that will have permitted signage. The plan requires that when the existing wall signs are replaced a conforming wall sign will be built.

Mr. Julian asked for the staff report.

Staff noted corrections to the text of the report regarding square footage permitted by the Sign Ordinance and stated that with the addition of the following conditions this petition substantially complies with the requirements listed in Section 4.13-8.C of the Zoning Ordinance (Requirements for a Master Sign Plan).

1. A condition should be noted that all sign colors and color regulations must comply with the existing Zoning Ordinance.
2. The Zoning Ordinance permits only 136 square feet of signage on the front of the building, approximately twenty-nine (29) percent more signage than proposed by the petitioner. The building sits on six (6) individual parcels. Allowed signage per parcel is as follows:
 - a. Sign Area 1 (243): 45 square feet of signage allowed; 26 square feet of signage proposed.
 - b. Sign Area 2 (245): 45 square feet of signage allowed; 43 square feet proposed.
 - c. Sign Area 3 (247): 46 square feet of signage allowed; 37 square feet proposed.

Staff recommends that the petitioner be allowed to use the full 136 square feet of the allowed wall signage in whatever allotment per sign deemed appropriate by the petitioner. The height recommendation for the Sign Area 1 and Sign Area 2 is 12 feet in height and the height for Sign Area 3 is 17.4 feet.

3. The window sign as proposed is acceptable.

Mr. Julian asked if the board were ready to consider a motion.

Motion by Mr. Petersen to approve ARC 05-23 subject to the changes in the staff report. Ms. Plummer seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote

Julian – yes

Plummer - yes

Petersen - yes

Troy - yes

O'Donnell – yes

Motion carried.

Mr. Ignarski asked for the allowable depth of the sign. The proposed depth is eleven (11) inches.

Mr. Wallace commented that the proposed depth is not allowable under the Sign Ordinance.

Ms. Plummer asked if this request could be approved based on the extenuating circumstances of the building.

Mr. Wallace commented that the request could be approved, subject to a variation.

Mr. Julian suggested have the contractor re-examine the dimensions of the raceway to make it fit the requirements of the Master Sign Plan

Mr. Julian asked the Commission if they wanted to recant their motion for approval. The Commission replied no.

Mr. Julian advised the petitioner that the request has already been approved with the depth not exceeding six (6) inches. The petitioner will have to comply with the requirements of the Master Sign Plan.

Mr. Wallace advised Mr. Ignarski to ask the owner to meet with staff for other options to installing the sign.

Approval of the Minutes

The Commission asked that a revision be made to page 7 of the September 8, 2005 minutes.

Motion by Mr. Petersen to approve the September 8, 2005 minutes with the modifications. Ms. Troy seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote

Plummer - yes

Petersen - yes

Troy - yes

O'Donnell – yes

Motion carried.

Planners Report

Mr. Wallace advised the Commission on future cases.

Adjournment

Motion by Mr. Petersen to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Plummer seconded the motion. Voice vote noted all ayes. The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Paula Emerson
Recording Secretary

John Julian III, Chairperson
Architectural Review Commission